

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/743,572	12/22/2003	Masao Umemoto	0524-0154	7991	
7590 06/19/2006			EXAMINER		
-	K, MCFARRON, MA	GREEN, ANTHONY J			
CUMMINGS & Suite 2850	MEHLER, LTD.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
200 West Adams St.			1755		
Chicago, IL 6	0606		DATE MAILED: 06/19/2000	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				5		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/743,572	UMEMOTO, MASAC)		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Anthony J. Green	1755			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app		1	ress		
Period for	• •					
WHICH - Extension - Extension - If NO per - Failure to Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE on sof time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this com BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 15 M	ay 2006.				
		action is non-final.				
3)□ S	ince this application is in condition for allowar		tters, prosecution as to the r	nerits is		
C	losed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Dispositio	n of Claims					
4)⊠ C	claim(s) <u>15-17</u> is/are pending in the application	1 .				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ C	claim(s) <u>15-17</u> is/are rejected.					
7) 🗌 C	claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) 🗌 C	claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application	n Papers					
9)□ Tł	ne specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
	ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) _ acc		by the Examiner.			
	pplicant may not request that any objection to the					
R	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFF	₹ 1.121(d).		
11)[] TI	ne oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTC)-152.		
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<u> </u>	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	& 119(a)-(d) or (f)			
· ·	All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under do 0.0.0.	3 1 10(4) (4) 01 (1).			
·	. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.				
	. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No.			
	. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			tage		
	application from the International Bureau			. J		
* Se	e the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	t received.			
Attachment(s	s)					
	of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)			
· <u>—</u>	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-	152)		
	No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other: _		-		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment submitted on 15 May 2006.
 Currently claims 15-17 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Specification No. 52-052256 for the reasons set forth in the previous office action which are herein incorporated by reference.

Applicant argues that the instant claims are not rendered obvious by the reference as the major component of the reference is sodium nitrate which is different than that instantly claimed.

It is the position of the examiner that the instant claims are rendered obvious by the reference as the instant claims are not limited to just a binary composition in water. Note that the reference teaches amounts of components that encompass the amounts instantly claimed. Further it is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art

Art Unit: 1755

composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d. 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Specification No. 55-161878 for the reasons set forth in the previous office action which are herein incorporated by reference.

Applicant argues that the instant composition is not suggested by the reference as the reference teaches that after water is added temperature depression takes place and the nature of this phenomenon is very different from the agent of claim 16.

It is the position of the examiner that while the reference does not recite that the composition is a cold storage agent it is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d. 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

Art Unit: 1755

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Specification No. 63-086791 for the reasons set forth in the previous office action which are herein incorporated by reference.

Applicant argues that the instant composition is not suggested by the reference as the compound of the reference is not a simple mixture of MgCl₂ and CaCl₂ and the examples do not show an obvious freezing point.

It is the position of the examiner that while the reference does not recite that the composition is a cold storage agent or show that the composition has an obvious freezing point that falls within the scope of the claim it is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d. 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971). Note also that applicant's claim is drafted as a product-by-process claim and that it does not positively recite that the composition is frozen.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony J.

Green whose telephone number is 571-272-1367. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1096.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1755

ajg June 13, 2006